

FONT AND NEW CANOPY, WARE CHURCH.



INTERIOR OF WARE CHURCH, HERTS.

In former numbers of our journal, we gave a view of the exterior of Ware Church, then recently restored by the parishioners at a considerable cost, and a description of the building and of the works done.* We now add, at the request of some correspondents, a view of part of the interior, and the font with its new oaken canopy. The font is very curious, and was given to the church in the time of Henry IV. The eight panels, as we have elsewhere mentioned, contain representations of St. Gabriel, the Virgin, St. John Baptist, St. Thomas, St. Catherine, St. George, St. Christopher, and St. Margaret.

The view of the interior is made looking south-east, and shows the chancel, Lady Chapel,

and south transept. The screen separating the two latter is of oak; the clustered column in the opening between the chancel and the chapel is of Purbeck marble, polished. The altar-rail is of oak, with kneeling figures on the gateposts. The large window in south transept was put in some years ago. The roof of the nave (not seen) is much better than that of the chancel.

LONDON CITY IMPROVEMENTS.—The measure for opening a new street crossing from Queen-street by Bow-lane, Bread-street, Friday-street, Distaff-lane, and Old Change, to St. Paul's Churchyard, and for improving Grosham-street West, and Threadneedle-street, has been opened in committee. The money (200,000*l.*) is to be raised on the city revenues and estates.

UNITY FOR PROGRESS IN ARCHITECTURE

THE subject of Progress in Architecture, and Copyism, mooted in your pages of late, appears one of the most important we have had before us for some time past. Not that it is a new one with you, but that the controversy is becoming closer and assuming a more practical tendency than it has hitherto done.

A communication I made to you in July, 1846,* bearing on this subject, contains views which, with some modifications, still appear to be right. Certain it is, that such as have returned to old paths have taken a decided course in search of truth, have learnt the elements of their art, and are, perhaps, as a body, in unity with itself, nearer to the development of a new style than those imagine who are yet separated and undecided what is truth and where it is to be found. A word of Scripture, with all reverence spoken, seems exquisitely appropriate to the state in which architecture has been and is—"That which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body which shall be;" 1 Cor. xv. 36, 37; and thus I use the word *development*, as a plant breaks the ground and unfolds its lovely flower, and even in death beareth seed for other varieties of the same species. Spontaneous generation, unknown in nature, is no more so in art, if our studies and theories of the past be true: all witness, that architecture continued to proceed from and to grow out of itself; beauties unfolded themselves to the mind of man as a reward for his study and actual labour, and his hand was moved as by a spirit to fashion out the same according to the pattern thus manifested unto him: man owes all to the living principles revealed in architecture during the time of his *industrious labour* upon it: architecture owes to man his beautiful handiwork.

Practically, is it not union we want? else how is it that all mediæval work of the same age bears so much the same image. There is the Institute and many architectural societies in correspondence with each other, and with the foreign institutes, and yet there are but few common guiding principles among us in design. T. M. W.

COLUMNS AS MONUMENTS.
MONUMENT TO EBENEZER ELLIOTT.

AT a meeting held in Sheffield a few days ago, to determine on the erection of a monument to Ebenezer Elliott, enough was said to lead to the belief that the opinion of those who were arranging the matter was in favour of a column for that purpose. A correspondent writes us as follows, and we fully agree with him in the objection to the form in question, and have long ago expressed it. He says,—In erecting insulated columns as monuments to departed worth, we have blundered in the wake of the Romans, who took the idea from the appropriate cenotaphal structures of the Egyptians—obelisks. The obelisk is expressive of its purposes: its form and associations alike palpably indicate the object of its erection: it stands forth a monolith, complete in itself, to record a people's gratitude, or to proclaim some deed accomplished—some fact. Not so the column: it is like an adjective, or a note of admiration—alone it has no meaning. Shorn of architrave, frieze, and cornice, it is necessarily suggests the complement of its "order": a superincumbent entablature is as essential to its completeness as is a base or capital. Its proportion as to height alone recommends it. Apart from a building, wrested from its proper position as a prop or support, it is but as a leg without a body—a disjointed limb. What is characteristic in it, considered as a member of an architectural composition—as part of an order, ceases to have propriety or meaning, when it is converted into an independent object. Then, the absurdity of placing a figure on the top, making it appear indifferent to its position in the clouds, as a height sufficient to make the brain of an ordinary mortal reel,—exposing it, too, to the genial influence of this delightful climate of ours,—subjecting it to colds, and influenzas, and rheumatism. Really, we ought to be guided by common sense in these matters: high

* See Vol. V., p. 613, and Vol. VII., p. 436.